

## REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 29, 2008, the Examiner stated that the specification filed on June 13, 2008 has not been entered because it did not conform with 37 C.F.R. 1.125(b) and (c) because the Applicants' remarks at that time failed to assert that no new matter had been entered. As the Examiner should have noted all that was added to the specification that was filed on June 13, 2008 were page numbers, which was explicitly stated in the remarks, but nevertheless, Applicants hereby state the following to come into exact compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.125(b) and (c):


No new matter was entered in the substitute specification that was  
filed on June 13, 2008.

Claims 25-56 were objected to because of the informality noted on page 2 of the Office Action mailed August 29, 2008, and the Examiner will please note that the word "distinct" has now been correctly spelled in line 4 of claim 25. This claim objection is now rendered moot, Applicants believe.

Claims 25-56 were also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, but the Examiner kindly set forth a proposed amendment to claim 25 that would overcome this rejection, and as the Examiner will please note claim 25 has been amended to incorporate the exact suggestions presented by the Examiner to gain its allowance. Applicants now believe that the rejection of claims 25-56 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, has been rendered moot.

Lastly, in numbered paragraph 6 of the Office Action mailed August 29, 2008, the Examiner stated that with appropriate amendments to claim 25, discussed above, that no prior art of record would render the amended claims unpatentable, and therefore allowance of all claims 25-56, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Clifford W. Browning

Reg. No. 32,201

Krieg DeVault LLP

One Indiana Square

Suite 2800

Indianapolis, IN 46204

(317) 238-6203